



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,883	12/13/2000	Jeffrey A. Dean	0026-0006	5681
44989	7590	05/03/2007	EXAMINER	
HARRITY SNYDER, LLP 11350 Random Hills Road SUITE 600 FAIRFAX, VA 22030			DEBROW, JAMES J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/734,883	DEAN ET AL.
	Examiner James J. Debrow	Art Unit 2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 39 and 41-66 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 39 and 41-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02 February 2007</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 02 Feb. 2007.
2. Claims 39 and 41-66 are pending in this case. Claims 39, 47, 52 and 59 are independent claims.

Applicant's Response

3. In Applicant's Response dated 02 Feb. 2007, Applicant amended canceled Claims 1-34, 37, 38 and 40; amended Claim 39; added new Claims 41-66; argued rejections of previous action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. **Claims 39, 41, 44-53, 56-61 and 64-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Authurs (Patent No.: US 6,591,261 B1; Effective Filing Date: Jun. 21, 1999) in view of Pant et al. (Patent No.: 6,012,053; Filed Jun. 23, 1997) (hereinafter 'Pant').**

In regards to independent claim 39, Authurs discloses a computer-implemented method comprising:

identifying a document that is stored on a server in a network and that includes links to linked documents (col. 4, lines 1-24; Arthurs disclose identifying a document that contains links to other documents.);

determining scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document (col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose the search results are ranked in accordance to their score.);

Arthurs discloses the listing of links can be sorted by various conventional techniques (col. 4, lines 16-21), however Arthurs does not expressly disclose *modifying the identified document based on the determined scores, where the modifying includes:*

reordering at least two of the links based on the determined scores, or sorting at least two of the links based on the determined scores; and providing the modified document to a user.

However, Pant teaches *modifying the identified document based on the determined scores, where the modifying includes:*

reordering at least two of the links based on the determined scores, or sorting at least two of the links based on the determined scores (col. 2, lines 25-43; col. 3, lines 56-63; Pant teaches a sorting module which sorts the search results in an order ranked according to their relevance score.); *and providing the modified document to a user* (col. 2, lines 25-43; col. 3, lines 56-63; Pant teaches sorted/modified results are provided to the user.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Arthurs with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claims 41 and 61, Arthurs discloses *the wherein the links in the identified document point to a plurality of linked documents; and wherein determining the scores includes:*

for each of the linked documents, determining scores for one or more linking documents that contain links to the linked document (col. 7, line 47-col. 8, line 63; col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose displaying the ranked associates sites with their corresponding links. The results are order ranked according to their relevance score.),

determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the scores of the one or more linking documents (col. 7, line 47-col. 8, line 63; col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose displaying the ranked associates sites with their corresponding links. The results are order ranked according to their relevance score.),

associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document (col. 8, lines 18-42; Arthurs

discloses the server system compares the associated sites with the web sites sites retrieved during the initial search result. col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose displaying the ranked associates sites with their corresponding links. The results are order ranked according to their relevance score. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes the Authers teaches and/or suggest associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document in order to determine the display ranking.).

In regards to dependent claims 44, 56 and 64, Authers disclose *the method wherein the links in the identified document point to a plurality of linked documents; and wherein determining the scores includes:*

receiving input from the user (col. 6, lines 43-47; Authers discloses through a computer system, the end-user typically visits a search engine site residing on a server computer system to enter a search query. Thus receiving input from the user.).

determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the received input (col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose the search results are ranked in accordance to their score.).

associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document

(col. 8, lines 18-42; Arthurs discloses the server system compares the associated sites with the web sites sites retrieved during the initial search result. col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose displaying the ranked associates sites with their corresponding links. The results are order ranked according to their relevance score. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes the Authers teaches and/or suggest associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document in order to determine the display ranking.).

In regards to dependent claims 45, 57 and 65, Authers disclose *the method of wherein determining the score for each of the linked documents includes:*

for each of the linked documents, comparing one or more words of the received input with a content of the linked document (col. 6, lines 43-55; Authers discloses through a computer system, the end-user typically visits a search engine site residing on a server computer system to enter a search query. Thus receiving input from the user.).

Arthurs does not expressly disclose *determining a score for the linked document based on a degree of match between the one or more words and the content of the linked document.*

However, Pant teaches *determining a score for the linked document based on a*

degree of match between the one or more words and the content of the linked document (col. 5, line 61-col. 6, line 15; col. 6, lines 58-col. 7, line 4; Pant teaches a relevance factor is the frequency of occurrence of a search term in all documents. The relevance determination module then provides the score results.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Arthurs with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claim 46, Arthurs discloses *the method of claim 39, wherein modifying the identified document includes:*

comparing the determined scores to a threshold (col.2, lines14-23; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36; Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold.).

deleting one of the links from the identified document when the determined score for the one of the links falls below the threshold (col.2, lines14-23; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36; Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold. Arthurs disclose the association database may utilize any threshold values to remove data from the database. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Arthurs teachings in

deleting one of the links from the identified document when the determined score for the one of the links falls below the threshold.).

In regards to independent claim 47, Authers discloses a *computer-implemented method, comprising:*

receiving a search query (col. 6, lines 43-47; Authers discloses through a computer system, the end-user typically visits a search engine site residing on a server computer system to enter a search query. Thus receiving input from the user.);

providing a list of search results in response to the search query (col. 4, lines 1-24; col. 7, line 4-col. 8, line 54; Arthurs disclose providing a list of search results in response to the search query.);

receiving selection of one of the search results in the list of search results (col. 4, lines 1-24; col. 7, line 4-col. 8, line 54; Arthurs discloses the user selects a displayed web site by clicking on a link.);

identifying links in a document corresponding to the selected search result (col. 4, lines 1-24; col. 7, line 4-col. 8, line 54; Arthurs discloses the user selects a displayed web site by clicking on a link adjacent to that web site via the end-user computer system mouse.);

determining a score for one of the links based on a degree of match between the search query and a content of a linked document pointed to by the one of the links (col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose the search results are ranked in accordance to their score.);

Arthurs does not expressly disclose *modifying the document based on the determined score for the one of the links ; providing the modified document.*

However, Pant teaches *modifying the document based on the determined score for the one of the links* (col. 2, lines 25-43; col. 3, lines 56-63; Pant teaches a sorting module which sorts the search results in an order ranked according to their relevance score.);

providing the modified document (col. 2, lines 25-43; col. 3, lines 56-63; Pant teaches sorted/modified results are provided to the user.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Arthurs with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claim 48, Arthurs disclose *the method of claim 47, wherein determining the score for the one of the links includes determining scores for each of a plurality of the links in the document based on a degree of match between the search query and a content of a linked document pointed to by the link* (col. 6, line 19-

col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose the search results are ranked in accordance to their score.);

Arthurs does not expressly disclose *wherein modifying the document includes: reordering the links based on the determined scores.*

However, Pant teaches *modifying wherein modifying the document includes: reordering the links based on the determined scores* (col. 2, lines 25-43; col. 3, lines 56-63; Pant teaches a sorting module which sorts the search results in an order ranked according to their relevance score.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Arthurs with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claim 49, Arthurs does not expressly disclose *the method of claim 48, wherein reordering the links includes: sorting the links based on the determined scores.*

However, Pant teaches *reordering the links includes: sorting the links based on*

the determined scores (col. 2, lines 25-43; col. 3, lines 56-63; Pant teaches a sorting module which sorts the search results in an order ranked according to their relevance score.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Arthurs with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claim 50, Arthurs does not expressly disclose *the method of claim 47, wherein modifying the document includes:*

changing at least one visual characteristic of the one of the links within the document based on the determined score.

However, Pant teaches *changing at least one visual characteristic of the one of the links within the document based on the determined score* (col. 6, line 50-col. 7, line 50; Pant teaches a sorting module which sorts/displays the search results based on different relevance factors. The Examiners using the broadest interpretation of a visual characteristic of the one of the links within the document based on the determined score to include placement of the link within the search result. Thus Pant teaches or suggests changing the visual characteristic of one of the links.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Arthurs with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claim 51, Arthurs discloses *the method of claim 47, further comprising:*

comparing the determined score to a threshold (col.2, lines14-23; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36; Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold.);

deleting the one of the links when the determined score for the one of the links falls below a threshold (col.2, lines14-23; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36; Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold. Arthurs disclose the association database may utilize any threshold values to remove data from the database. At the time of the invention it would have beenobvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Arthurs teachings in deleting one of the links from the identified document when the determined score for the one of the links falls below the threshold.).

In regards to independent claim 52, Authurs discloses a *computer-implemented method, comprising:*

identifying a document that is stored on a server in a network and that includes links to linked documents (col. 4, lines 1-24; Arthurs disclose identifying a document that contains links to other documents.);

determining scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document (col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose the search results are ranked in accordance to their score.);

comparing the determined scores to a threshold (col. 2, lines 14-23; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36; Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold.);

deleting one of the plurality of links from the identified document when the score for the one of the links falls below the threshold (col. 2, lines 14-23; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36; Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold. Arthurs disclose the association database may utilize any threshold values to remove data from the database. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Arthurs teachings in deleting one of the links from the identified document when the determined score for the one of the links falls below the threshold.)

providing, to a user, the identified document without the deleted link (col. 4, lines 1-24; Arthurs disclose identifying a document that contains links to other documents.).

In regards to dependent claim 53, Authurs discloses *the method of claim 52, wherein the links in the identified document point to a plurality of linked documents; and*

wherein determining the scores includes:

for each of the linked documents, determining scores for one or more linking documents that contain links to the linked document (col. 7, line 47-col. 8, line 63; col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose displaying the ranked associates sites with their corresponding links. The results are order ranked according to their relevance score.),

determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the scores of the one or more linking documents (col. 7, line 47-col. 8, line 63; col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose displaying the ranked associates sites with their corresponding links. The results are order ranked according to their relevance score.),

associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document (col. 8, lines 18-42; Arthurs discloses the server system compares the associated sites with the web sites sites retrieved during the initial search result. col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose displaying the ranked associates sites with their corresponding links. The results are order ranked according to their relevance score. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes the Authers teaches and/or suggest associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document in order to determine the display ranking.).

In regards to dependent claim 58, Arthurs disclose *the method of claim 52, further comprising:*

determining additional information regarding a linked document pointed to by the one of the plurality of links when the score for the one of the links does not fall below the threshold (col.2, lines14-23; col. 4, lines 1-16; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36); Arthurs discloses the list of the search results contain id (e.g., web page identifier) for all the links of each web page. Thus Arthurs disclose additional information regarding the linked document. Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold.).

providing the identified document with the additional information to the user (col.2, lines14-23; col. 6, line 5-col. 7, line 3).

In regards to independent claim 59, Arthurs disclose a system, comprising:
means for identifying a document based on an address associated with the document, the document including links that point to linked documents (col. 4, lines 1-24; Arthurs disclose identifying a document that contains links to other documents.);
means for determining scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document (col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose the search results are ranked in accordance to their score.);

means for comparing the determined scores to a threshold (col.2, lines14-23; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36; Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold.);

means for determining that a score for one of the plurality of links is greater than the threshold (col.2, lines14-23; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36; Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold.);

means for determining additional information regarding the linked document pointed to by the one of the plurality of links (col.2, lines14-23; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36; col. 4, lines 1-16; Arthurs discloses the list of the search results contain id (e.g., web page identifier) for all the links of each web page. Thus Arthurs disclose additional information regarding the linked document. Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold.);

means for providing the identified document with the additional information to a user (col.2, lines14-23; col. 6, line 5-col. 7, line 3).

In regards to dependent claim 60, Arthurs disclose *the system of claim 59, further comprising:*

means for determining that a score for another one of the plurality of links is not greater than the threshold (col.2, lines14-23; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36; Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold.);

means for deleting the other one of the plurality of links from the identified document (col.2, lines14-23; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36; Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold. Arthurs disclose the association database may utilize any threshold values to remove data from

the database. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Arthurs teachings in deleting one of the links from the identified document when the determined score for the one of the links falls below the threshold.);

means for providing, to a user, the identified document without the deleted link

(col. 4, lines 1-24; Arthurs disclose identifying a document that contains links to other documents.).

In regards to dependent claim 66, Arthurs does not expressly disclose *the system of claim 59, wherein the additional information includes an excerpt from the linked document, a size of the linked document, or a date of last modification of the linked document.*

However, Pant teaches *the additional information includes an excerpt from the linked document, a size of the linked document, or a date of last modification of the linked document* (col. 6, line 21-32; Pant teaches a relevance factor is a value associated with an attribute which an item in a database may have. For example whether a document contains a particular word is an attribute of a document, date, size and other features of a document may be attributes. It has been established and is well known in the art that these features are typically provider to the end-user as additional information of linked documents.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Arthurs with Pant for the benefit of providing a

mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

Note

6. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See, MPEP 2123.

7. **Claims 42, 43, 54, 55, 62 and 63,are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arthurs in view of Pant further in view of Page (Patent No.: 6,285,999 B1; Filed Jan. 09, 1998)**

In regards to dependent claims 42, 54 and 62, Arthurs discloses associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document (col. 8, lines 18-42; Arthurs discloses the server system compares the associated sites with the web sites sites retrieved during the initial search result. col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose displaying the ranked associates sites with their corresponding links. The results are order ranked according to their relevance score. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes the Authors

teaches and/or suggest associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document in order to determine the display ranking.).

Arthurs in view of Pant does not expressly disclose *the method wherein the links in the identified document point to a plurality of linked documents; and wherein determining the scores includes:*

determining a clickthrough rate for each of the linked documents.
determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the determined clickthrough rates.

However, Page teaches *determining a clickthrough rate for each of the linked documents; determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the determined clickthrough rates* (Page teaches determining the clickthrough rate for each of the linked documents based on determined clickthrough rates and associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the document. The examiner interprets the user of clickthrough rate in the claim as equivalent to determining the popularity or how many hits the documents has had by other links linking to the document and determining how important that document is. For example, Page discloses node ranking in a linked database to assign a rank to each document in the database where the document rank is a measure of the importance of the document based

on the anchor text of backlinks to the document (regardless of its content)(col 2, lines 40-65).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Arthurs in view of Pant to include determining importance, scoring and associating that with an entry in the document as taught by Page, providing the benefit of a simple method for determining the importance of a document by counting its number of citations (col 2, lines 20-35).

In regards to dependent claims 43, 55 and 63, Arthurs discloses *associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document* (col. 8, lines 18-42; Arthurs discloses the server system compares the associated sites with the web sites sites retrieved during the initial search result. col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose displaying the ranked associates sites with their corresponding links. The results are order ranked according to their relevance score. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes the Authers teaches and/or suggest associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document in order to determine the display ranking.).

Arthurs in view of Pant does not expressly disclose *the method wherein the links in the identified document point to a plurality of linked documents; and*

wherein determining the scores includes:

determining a measure of popularity associated with each of the linked documents,

determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the determined measure of popularity.

However, Page teaches *determining a measure of popularity associated with each of the linked documents, determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the determined measure of popularity* (Page teaches determining the clickthrough rate for each of the linked documents based on determined clickthrough rates and associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the document. The examiner interprets the user of clickthrough rate in the claim as equivalent to determining the popularity or how many hits the documents has had by other links linking to the document and determining how important that document is. For example, Page discloses node ranking in a linked database to assign a rank to each document in the database where the document rank is a measure of the importance of the document based on the anchor text of backlinks to the document (regardless of its content)(col 2, lines 40-65).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Arthurs in view of Pant to

include determining importance, scoring and associating that with an entry in the document as taught by Page, providing the benefit of a simple method for determining the importance of a document by counting its number of citations (col 2, lines 20-35).

Note

8. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. A new ground(s) of rejection is made in view Arthurs, Pant and Page.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100